



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/491,121	01/24/2000	Branko Kovacevic	1458-0000010	8119
34456 7590 08/02/2011 LARSON NEWMAN, LLP 5914 WEST COURTYARD DRIVE SUITE 200 AUSTIN, TX 78730			EXAMINER AN, SHAWN S	
			ART UNIT 2483	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 08/02/2011	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS  
AND INTERFERENCES

---

Ex parte BRANKO KOVACEVIC and KEVORK KECHICHIAN

---

Appeal 2011-005287  
Application 09/491,121  
Technology Center 2400

---

Before ALLEN R. MacDONALD, GREGORY J. GONSALVES, and  
JASON V. MORGAN, Administrative Patent Judges.

GONSALVES, Administrative Patent Judge.

DECISION ON APPEAL

STATEMENT OF CASE  
Introduction

Appellants appeal under 35 U.S.C. § 134 from a final rejection of claims 16-19 and 22-24. (App. Br. 2.) We have jurisdiction under 35 U.S.C. § 6(b).

*Examiner's Rejections*

The Examiner rejected claims 16-19 as unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Hoogenboom (U.S. Patent No. 5,517,250, May 14, 1996) and Ort (U.S. Patent No. 6,043,828, March 28, 2000). (Ans. 3.)

The Examiner rejected claims 22-24 as anticipated under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) by Hoogenboom. (Ans. 3.)

Exemplary Claim

Exemplary independent claim 16 under appeal reads as follows:

16. A method of parsing a data packet, the method comprising:
- providing a start indicator to a first parser, the start indicator indicating a first data block of the data packet, the data packet having a predetermined number of data blocks;
  - analyzing at the first parser at least a portion of the first N data blocks after the start of the data packet to determine a data type of a subsequent data block of the data packet, wherein the subsequent data block is after the first N data blocks;
  - enabling a second parser to receive the subsequent data block when the data type of the subsequent data block is a first data type; and
  - enabling a third parser to receive the subsequent data block when the data type of the subsequent data block is a second data type.

### Appellants' Contention

Appellants contend for multiple reasons that the Examiner erred in rejecting claims 16-19 as obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) and claims 22-24 as anticipated under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b).

### ANALYSIS

Appellants' present numerous contentions that the Hoogenboom and Ort references, relied on by the Examiner, fail to teach required claims limitations. See App. Br. 3-10. We agree with Appellants' contentions.

### CONCLUSIONS

(1) Appellants have established that the Examiner erred in rejecting claims 16-19 as obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

(2) Appellants have established that the Examiner erred in rejecting claims 22-24 as anticipated under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b).

### DECISION

The Examiner's rejections of claims 16-19 and 22-24 are reversed.

### REVERSED

dw